

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action dated December 28, 2007 has been carefully considered. In response to the Office Action, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 17, 19 and 21-22, which, when considered with the remarks set forth below, are deemed to place the case with Claims 1-28 in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that the prior art does not teach or render obvious the diffractive structure covering the first and/or the second regions of the thin film layer succession, as set forth in the claims.


Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

Claims 1-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner states that Claims 1 and 22 set forth a broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation being indefinite in the same claim. More particularly, the Examiner objects to the terms “in particular,” “preferably” and “and the like” set forth in the claims. In response, Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 22 to delete the objectionable phrases. In reviewing the remaining claims, Applicants have noted and have deleted similar objectionable phrases in Claims 17, 19 and 21. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections to Claims 1-28 have been overcome.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, favorable consideration and allowance of the application with Claims 1-28 are respectfully solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would assist in moving the application toward allowance, he is respectfully invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven T. Zuschlag
Registration No.: 43,309
Attorney for Applicants

HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 Jericho Turnpike
Syosset, New York 11791
(516) 822-3550
STZ/mf

288950_1.DOC